

The deal is scheduled to close in June.

Mamula spent eight years on the town planning commission and eight years on the town council before ascending to mayor. It was a good run.

"It was a tough decision. I stalled to the last minute," said the reluctant retiree who needs to spend more time with his convalescing wife.

"I really like being mayor. I liked being on the town council and I liked being on the planning commission. It really has been a labor of love for me rather than a carrying out of duties," he added.

Mamula called it "fulfilling" to work with a "great town council and staff."

"With a town manager like Tim Gagen, being mayor is 'relatively simple, frankly,'" Mamula said.

Mamula vows to stay involved in the town but promised not to become a "town council observer."

"There has got to be something I can cut out of this whole thing that someone is going to let me do," he added.

We hope so, too.

### RECOGNIZING THE 93D BIRTHDAY OF RONALD REAGAN

SPEECH OF

**HON. JOHN LINDER**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 3, 2004*

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday we celebrate the 93d birthday of Ronald Reagan and I rise again to recognize his efforts to renew the American spirit and to spread freedom around the world. Ronald Reagan once stated that, "The leadership of the free world was thrust upon us two centuries ago in that little hall of Philadelphia. In the days following World War II, when the economic strength and power of America was all that stood between the world and the return to the dark ages, Pope Pius XII said, 'The American people have a great genius for splendid and unselfish actions. Into the hands of America God has placed the destinies of an afflicted mankind.'" Reagan further stated that, "We are indeed, and we are today, the last best hope of man on earth." As we face many challenges today, the words of our 40th President still ring true. As we mark his birthday, we should remember his dream of creating a better, safer world and reaffirm that this Nation must continue to show the courage and persistence to turn that dream into a reality and provide hope for all those who do not have freedom.

### HAPPY 109TH BIRTHDAY, ARMINTA LESTARJETTE ULRICH

**HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 4, 2004*

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a very special woman, Arminta Lestarjette Ulrich, known simply by the name "Mint" to her friends. Mint will be celebrating her 109th birthday on February 21. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge this important milestone in her long and fruitful life.

Mint has had the gift of living through three centuries in this great Nation—one can only

imagine the many changes she has witnessed. She is a living time capsule, a treasure to us. By sharing her memories and experiences with us, we can learn more about ourselves and our Nation. Mint gives us strength in knowing where we came from and hope of who we can become.

Her full, rich life began in Cotulla, Texas in 1895. She was one of eleven children: five sisters and five brothers. The stories she tells of her youth allow us to vicariously experience life in the foreign land of South Texas as it was during the early part of the 20th century. For instance, Mint is often heard recounting how she used to ride atop a horse as it swam across the Nueces River. Or, how she used to travel by wagon to Kerrville, Texas, a journey that lasted two to three days. Today, this trip would take roughly three hours by car to complete.

Mint moved to San Antonio in 1915 where she began work as a switchboard operator for the Missouri Pacific Railroad. She worked with Missouri Pacific until her retirement. During her career, Arminta developed lasting friendships with workers all over the switchboard system.

One of the most enduring relationships she developed was with a young man who worked for the Southern Pacific Railroad—his name was Arthur Frederick Ulrich. Arthur grew to love Mint, but she was already engaged. However, like most young men suffering the pangs of love, Arthur was not dissuaded. He called her everyday and told her, "I'll get you yet". This persistence, coupled with her interest in his striking good looks and unquenchable high-spiritedness, made Arthur's prediction come true.

Mr. and Mrs. Ulrich were married on April 11, 1929 and did not have any children. Sadly, Arthur passed away in 1983, just six days before what would have been their 54th wedding anniversary. Their relationship was strong and serves as an example of the joy that a marriage can be if it is full of true friendship and love.

Mint has attributed her longevity to the use of "One-A-Day" vitamins and her lasting good looks to daily use of "Oil of Olay". I am suspicious, though, that her secret to long life and happiness also involves her sense of humor, positive attitude, and commitment to friends and family.

I am proud to count myself among those who have had the opportunity to know and learn from Mint. Her joy of living and her humanity have helped her to become an enduring spirit that continues to spread joy to those who know her. I wish her many blessings and the very best for her 109th birthday.

### CONGRATULATING STEARNS COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT AS MIN- NESOTA'S OUTSTANDING SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DIS- TRICT OF THE YEAR

**HON. MARK R. KENNEDY**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 4, 2004*

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Administrator Dennis Fuchs, the staff and board of supervisors,

and all the residents of Stearns County, Minnesota, on Stearns County's recognition as Minnesota's Outstanding Soil and Water Conservation District of the Year.

Stearns County Soil and Water Conservation District has been very active in protecting natural resources for all to enjoy. The District has been successful in developing programs to assist landowners with such conservation practices as soil erosion prevention, animal waste storage, wildlife habitat preservation, and lakeshed management.

This award is based on a number of factors including program participation, training for staff and supervisors, and increased involvement in Minnesota's Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts work to better manage our precious natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all Minnesotans I would like to congratulate Stearns County Soil and Water Conservation District on receiving this recognition and thank them for their commitment to conservation.

### HONORING OBIE SNIDER

**HON. BILL SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 4, 2004*

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Obie Snider, an extraordinary man who passed away on the night of December 18, 2003. After enlightening the lives of those around him for seventy-seven years, the memories of his generosity and genuine care for others have served to comfort those who knew him best, as well as the community which benefitted tremendously from his numerous contributions.

As a pillar of strength within his community of Bedford County, Pennsylvania, Mr. Snider was a role model and leader who was admired for his loyalty to God, his family, and his comrades. With the help of his vision and guidance the East Freedom Chapel was founded, and it was under that roof that he became director of Young Life in the 1950s. Mr. Snider remained a devoted Christian throughout his life, and that piety translated into his every action. In addition to being a Sunday school teacher, he was the chairman of Truth and Praise, a publisher of hymnals, and the chairman of the Christian Workers Fellowship Fund of Kansas, among other things.

After graduating from Repogle High School in 1943, Mr. Snider's experiences in college prepared him for the enriched life he would lead. Two years after marrying Mary Ann Gilbert on June 1, 1948, he graduated from Penn State University. Grounded by a strong marriage and a solid education, Mr. Snider established Singing Brook Farms and eventually became a trustee of his alma mater, a position that lasted 21 years. His appointment to Trustee Chairman in 1985 marked the first time that an agriculturalist filled the role, and in the years following he was named a distinguished alumnus and received the status of trustee emeritus in July of 2000. Mr. Snider dedicated a large portion of his time to the improvement of the university and succeeded in administering numerous changes throughout the system. Without Obie Snider's influence and vision, Penn State University would not be the renowned institution of higher learning that it is today.

Mr. Snider's commitment to agriculture and education has proved to affect and benefit not only the state of Pennsylvania, but the entire nation. The numerous organizations and boards that he selflessly served were all positively changed by his presence, and they will undoubtedly miss his spirit and direction. Obie Snider has left behind a legacy of dignity and merit that will not be forgotten.

FORMER BUSH INSIDERS NOW  
FREE TO TELL THE TRUTH

**HON. BARNEY FRANK**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 4, 2004*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a very interesting phenomenon in recent months that demands attention. A steady stream of former high-ranking Bush administration officials have conscientiously pointed out the inaccuracy of many of the claims the administration has made and continues to make about its policies.

In December, last year, I inserted into these pages a very interesting article by Richard Haass, former chief of the policy planning staff of the State Department, who confirmed what many of us have long argued—namely, that the war in Iraq was a war of choice and not of necessity. That is, Mr. Haass made it clear that the decision to go to war with Iraq was not driven by a fear that Iraq was any serious threat to the United States of a physical sort, but rather was part of an administration policy about how the world ought to be structured.

Most dramatically, former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill has been widely quoted as a result of the book by Ron Suskind not only essentially agreeing with Mr. Haass about the genesis of the Iraq war, but making clear the great gap that exists between the reality of Bush administration economic policies and the rhetoric they have used to describe them.

Recently, a third high-ranking Bush official has rebutted the administration's claims, and buttressed this with reference to actual events in which he participated as a member of the administration.

Flynt Leverett was a high-ranking official at the National Security Council from 2002 until 2003, serving as Senior Director for Middle Eastern Affairs. In a recent article published in the New York Times, he refutes the administration's argument that the decision by Libya to renounce nuclear weapons was a direct result of the administration's war in Iraq. His argument is a compelling one, combining very thoughtful analysis with a good history of the events that led up to this. It is impossible to do justice to this thoughtful essay by compressing it, so I ask that it be inserted here so that Members and others may read it and draw their own conclusions.

But I do believe that the conclusion of Mr. Leverett's article—remember he was a high-ranking National Security Council official appointed by the Bush administration—is worth underlining:

Until the Bush administration learns the real lessons of the Libyan precedent, policy toward other rogue regimes is likely to remain stuck in the mud of ideology.

[From the New York Times]

A LESSON IN DIPLOMACY

MORE THAN THREATS LED TO QADDAFI'S  
REVERSAL

(By Flynt Leverett)

WASHINGTON.—As President George W. Bush made clear in his State of the Union address, he sees the striking developments in relations with Libya as the fruit of his strategy in the war on terrorism.

The idea is that Colonel Muammar el-Qaddafi's apparent decision to renounce weapons of mass destruction was largely a result of the overthrow of Saddam Hussein, which thus retroactively justifies the war in Iraq and holds out the prospect of similar progress with other states that support terrorists, seek weapons of mass destruction and brutalize their own people.

However, by linking shifts in Libya's behavior to the Iraq war, the president misrepresents the real lesson of the Libyan case. This confusion undermines America's chances of getting countries like Iran and Syria to follow Libya's lead.

The roots of the recent progress with Libya go back not to the eve of the Iraq war, but to the Bush administration's first year in office. Indeed, some credit should even be given to the second Clinton administration.

Tired of international isolation and economic sanctions, the Libyans decided in the late 1990's to seek normalized relations with the United States, and held secret discussions with Clinton administration officials to convey that message. The Clinton White House made clear that no movement toward better relations was possible until Libya met its responsibilities stemming from the downing of Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, in 1988.

These discussions, along with mediation by the Saudi ambassador to the United States, Prince Bandar ibn Sultan, produced a breakthrough: Libya turned over two intelligence officers implicated in the Pan Am 103 attack to the Netherlands for trial by a Scottish court, and in 1999 Washington acquiesced to the suspension of UN sanctions against Libya.

Then, in the spring of 2001, when I was a member of the State Department's policy planning staff, the Bush administration picked up on those discussions and induced the Libyans to meet their remaining Lockerbie obligations.

With our British colleagues, we presented the Libyans with a "script" indicating what they needed to do and say to satisfy our requirements on compensating the families of Pan Am 103 victims and accepting responsibility for the actions of the Libyan intelligence officers implicated in the case.

We also put an explicit quid pro quo on the table: If Libya met the conditions we laid out, the United States and Britain would allow UN sanctions to be lifted permanently. This script became the basis for three-party negotiations to resolve the Lockerbie issue.

By early 2003, after a Scottish appeals court upheld the conviction of one of the Libyan intelligence officers, it was evident that our approach would bear fruit. Indeed, Washington allowed the UN sanctions against Libya to be removed last summer after Libya reached a compensation agreement with the Pan Am 103 families and accepted responsibility for its officials' actions.

But during these two years of talks, American negotiators consistently told the Libyans that resolving the Lockerbie situation would lead to no more than elimination of UN sanctions. To get out from under the separate U.S. sanctions, Libya would have to address other concerns, particularly regarding its programs in weapons of mass destruction.

This is the context in which Libyan officials approached the United States and Britain last spring to discuss dismantling Libya's weapons program. The Iraq war, which had not yet started, was not the driving force behind Libya's move. Rather, Libya was willing to deal because of credible diplomatic representations by the United States over the years, which convinced the Libyans that doing so was critical to achieving their strategic and domestic goals.

Just as with Lockerbie, an explicit quid pro quo was offered: American officials indicated that a verifiable dismantling of Libya's weapons projects would lead to the removal of American sanctions, perhaps by the end of this year.

The lesson is incontrovertible: To persuade a rogue regime to get out of the terrorism business and give up its weapons of mass destruction, the United States must not only apply pressure but also make clear the potential benefits of cooperation.

Unfortunately, the Bush administration has refused to take this approach with other rogue regimes, notably Iran and Syria. Until the president is willing to employ carrots as well as sticks, he will make little headway in changing Iranian or Syrian behavior.

The President's lack of initiative on this point is especially disappointing because, in the diplomatic aftermath of the Sept. 11 attacks, the administration had a singular opportunity to effect strategic realignments by both Iran and Syria.

Well-placed Iranians, including more pragmatic elements of Iran's conservative camp, have indicated through diplomatic channels and to former officials (including myself) their interest in a "grand bargain" with the United States. Basically, Tehran would trade off its ties to terrorist groups and pursuit of nuclear weapons for security guarantees, a lifting of sanctions and normalized relations with Washington.

Likewise, senior Syrian officials—including President Bashar Assad himself, in a conversation in Damascus last week—have told me that they want a better strategic understanding with the United States. To achieve this, however, Washington needs to be willing to spell out what Syria would get in return for giving up its ties to terrorists and its chemical weapons and ballistic missiles. As Assad told me, Syria is "a state, not a charity"—if it gives up something, it must know what it will gain in return.

One reason the Bush administration was able to take a more constructive course with Libya was that the White House, uncharacteristically, sidelined the administration's neoconservative wing—which strongly opposes any offer of carrots to state sponsors of terrorism, even when carrots could help end such problematic behavior—when crucial decisions were made.

The initial approach on the Lockerbie case was approved by an informal coalition made up of Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser, and Secretary of State Colin Powell. Likewise, in the lead up to the negotiations involving Libyan weapons of mass destruction, the neoconservatives at the Pentagon and in the shop of Under Secretary of State John Bolton were left out of the loop.

Perhaps a coalition among members of the State Department's bureau of Near Eastern affairs and the National Security Council's more pragmatic elements can chart a similar course involving Iran and Syria.

However, until the Bush administration learns the real lessons of the Libyan precedent, policy toward other rogue regimes is likely to remain stuck in the mud of ideology.